



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/568,746

02/21/2006

Hiroshi Taki

427972000700

9542

25227 7590 03/18/2008
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD
SUITE 400
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

CHEN, VIVIAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1794

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/18/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ADVISORY ACTION

Response to Proposed Amendments

1. The proposed amendments will **NOT** be entered because they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. The newly added limitations with respect to coating layers with a coating containing the specified ratio of components (A) and (B) were not previously presented or claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. Claims 1-2 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over:
OKAJIMA ET AL (US 5,932,320).
2. Claims 5, 7 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over:
OKAJIMA ET AL (US 5,932,320),
as applied in claim 1,
and further in view of MIZUNO (US 5,472,589) or MIZUNO (US 5,413,840).
3. Claims 3-4, 6, 8-12 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over:
(a) OKAJIMA ET AL (US 5,932,320), as applied in claim 1; or
(b) OKAJIMA ET AL (US 5,932,320), in view of MIZUNO (US 5,472,589) or MIZUNO
(US 5,413,840), as applied in claim 5;
and further in view of GEORGE ET AL (US 5,369,211).

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 2/28/2008 with respect to the proportions of components (A) to (B) have been considered but are moot because the proposed amendments filed 2/28/2008 have **NOT** been entered.

2. Applicant's arguments filed 2/28/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

(A) Applicant argues that OKAJIMA ET AL fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention because the films in OKAJIMA ET AL have "a high hiding power" and "low transparency". In response to applicant's argument that OKAJIMA ET AL fails to disclose films for optical applications, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. Opacity or limited transparency does not inherently render a film unsuitable for "optical applications", since in certain optical applications or devices, opacity or controlled light transmission may be a desirable or even a necessary characteristic. Furthermore, OKAJIMA ET AL explicitly states that the disclosed film, while capable of high opacity and hiding characteristics, is also suitable for use as a clear film (e.g., a clear protective layer for a decorated substrate, etc.) (OKAJIMA ET AL, line 23-35, col. 5; line 25-30, col. 7). Therefore, contrary to Applicant's contentions, OKAJIMA ET AL's teachings are not solely directed to high opacity films (and thereby teaching away from transparent films), but

Art Unit: 1794

also explicitly discloses and teaches a variant which is clear (e.g., transparent). In view of the reference's statements regarding suitability in clear film applications, one of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably believe that the film of OKAJIMA ET AL is capable of relatively high levels of clarity and transparency if desired (e.g., in order to not obscure a desirable or attractive underlying design or pattern, etc.).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vivian Chen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1506. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8:30 AM to 6 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano, can be reached on (571) 272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

The General Information telephone number for Technology Center 1700 is (571) 272-1700.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

March 10, 2008

/Vivian Chen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794